DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 238 HE 024 314

TITLE Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers. A Revision of the Commission's 1982 Guidelines and Procedures for Review of New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers. Commission Report 90-9.

INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.

PUB DATE Jan 90

NOTE 20p.

AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office of the Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.

PUB TYPE Guides - General (050)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Campus Planning; College Buildings; *Educational Facilities; Educational Planning; Guidelines; Higher Education; Land Use; Multicampus Colleges; *Off Campus Facilities; Policy Formation; Review (Reexamination); School Expansion; State Colleges; State Universities; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This report updates the reviewing guidelines of the California State Postsecondary Education Commission for proposals for new public university or college campuses (issued in 1982) in order to make them more appropriate to current needs. Four major changes are added from the 1982 version: (1) a request to all three public segments of higher education in California that all proposals for new campuses be prepared in the context of a statewide plan that is made available to the Commission for review and comment; (2) a request that the segments inform the Commission of their plans for new campuses before the site selection process, so as to give the Commission the opportunity to make suggestions about whether the process should move forward before the fact of land acquisition; (3) a request that all final proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers include a completed environmental impact report; and (4) a request that each segment include in its final proposal plans information on how the campus or center will meet the State's policy goals of access, quality, and educational equity, as well as some preliminary plans about the academic or programmatic character of the campus or center. The review process guidelines are provided. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Postsecondary Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary

Existing law states the intention of the Legislature that no proposals for new public university or college campuses be approved by the Legislature unless such proposals have been reviewed and recommended by this Commission. The process for Commission review of proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers has not been substantially changed since it was first developed in 1975, although it was modified most recently in 1982. As the Commission prepares for its role in coordinating the planning process for expansion to meet the needs of the twenty-first century, one of its priorities has been to update those guidelines to make them more appropriate to current needs.

Four major differences between this set of guidelines and the 1982 version (which is appended on pages 7-13) are these additions:

1. A request to the segments that all proposals for new campuses be prepared in the context of a statewide plan that is made available to the Commission for review and comment;

2. A request that the segments inform the Commission of their plans for new campuses before the site selection process, so as to give the Commission the opportunity to make suggestions about whether the process should move forward before the fact of land acquisition;

3. A request that all final proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers include a completed Environmental Impact Report; and

4. A request that each segment include in its final proposal plans for how the campus or center will meet the State's policy goals of access, quality, and educational equity, as well as some preliminary plans about the academic or programmatic character of the campus or center.

The Commission adopted these guidelines at its meeting on January 22, 1990, on recommendation of its Policy Evaluation Committee, and on the assumption that the implementation of these new guidelines will be phased in as appropriate to the current planning process of the segments and the Commission. Additional copies may be obtained from the Publications Office of the Commission at (916) 324-4991. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Jane Wellman -- the associate director of the Commission -- at (916) 322-8017.

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED CAMPUSES AND OFF-CAMPUS CENTERS

A Revision of the Commission's 1982 Guidelines and Procedures for Review of New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 90-9
PUBLISHED JANUARY 1990

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 90-9 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

Introduction 1

Commission Responsibilities and Authority Regarding New Campuses and Centers 1

Evolution and Purpose of the Guidelines 1

Reasons for the Current Revisions 1

Policy Assumptions Used in Developing These Guidelines 1

Projects Subject to Commission Review 2

Schedule for the Review of New Projects 2

Criteria for Evaluating Proposals 3

Appendix: 1982 Guidelines and Procedures for Review of New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers 7

Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers

Introduction

Commission responsibilities and authority regarding new campuses and centers

California *Education Code* Section 66904 expresses the intent of the Legislature that the sites for new institutions or branches of public postsecondary education will not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the Commission:

> It is the intent of the Legislature that sites for new institutions or branches of the University of California and the California State University, and the classes of off-campus centers as the commission shall determine, shall not be authorized or acquired unless recommended by the commission.
>
> It is further the of the Legislature that California community colleges shall not receive state funds for acquisition of sites or construction of new institutions, branches or off-campus centers unless recommended by the commission. Acquisition or construction of non-state-funded community colleges, branches and off- campus centers, and proposals for acquisition or construction shall be reported to and may be reviewed and commented upon by the Commission.

Evolution and purpose of the guidelines

In order to carry out its given responsibilities in this area, the Commission in April 1975 adopted policies relating to the review of new campuses and centers and revised those policies in September 1978 and September 1982. Both the 1975 document and the two revisions outlined the Commission's basic assumptions under which the guidelines and procedures were developed and then specified the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the segments when submitting proposals, and the contents of the required "needs studies."

Reasons for the current revisions

By 1988, experience with the existing procedures suggested that they needed revision in order to accommodate the changed planning environment in California, particularly related to California's Environmental Quality Act and the environmental impact report (EIR) process, as well as to accommodate various provisions of the recently renewed Master Plan for Higher Education. In addition, California's postsecondary enrollment demand continues to increase, and as the public segments move forward with their long-range facilities plans, the time is particularly ripe for revising the existing guidelines. This revision is intended to (1) ensure that the public segments grow in an orderly and efficient manner and that they meet the State's policy objectives for postsecondary education under the Master Plan, (2) ensure proper and timely review by the State of segmental plans based on clearly stated criteria, and (3) assist the segments in determining the procedures that need to be followed to prepare and implement their expansion plans.

Policy assumptions used in developing these guidelines

The following six policy assumptions are central to the development of the procedures and criteria that the Commission uses in reviewing proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers:

1. It will continue to be State policy that each resident of California who has the capacity and motivation to benefit from higher education will have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education. The California Community Colleges shall continue to be accessible to all persons at least 18 years of age who can benefit from the instruction offered, regardless of district boundaries. The California State University and the University of California shall continue to be accessible to first-time freshmen among the pool

of students eligible according to Master Plan eligibility guidelines. Master Plan guidelines on undergraduate admission priorities will continue to be (1) continuing undergraduates in good standing; (2) California residents who are successful transfers from California public community colleges; (3) California residents entering at the freshman or sophomore level; and (4) residents of other states or foreign counties.

2. The differentiation of function between the segments with regard to institutional mission shall continue to be as defined by the State's Master Plan for Higher Education.

3. The University of California plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide need.

4. The California State University plans and develops its campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations.

5. The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of local needs.

6. Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public postsecondary education. These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, community and campus environment, limitations on campus size, program requirements and student enrollment levels, and internal organization. Planned capacities are established by the governing boards of community college districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges), the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of California. These capacities, as well as the statewide procedures for setting these capacities, are subject to review and recommendation by the Commission provided in California *Education Code* Section 66903.

Projects subject to Commission review

The following types of projects are subject to review: new campuses and permanent off-campus centers, major off-campus centers in leased facilities, and conversion of off-campus centers to full-service campuses. The Commission may also review and comment on other projects consistent with its overall State planning and coordination role.

Schedule for the review of new projects

The following timelines are meant to allow a reasonable amount of time for Commission review of plans at appropriate stages in the process. The Commission can accelerate its review of the process if it so chooses.

Unless otherwise specified, all three public postsecondary segments should endeavor to observe theses timelines when proposing construction of a major new project subject to Commission review under these guidelines:

1. Plans for new campuses and permanent off-campus centers should be made by the segmental governing boards following their adoption of a systemwide planning framework designed to address total statewide segmental long-range growth needs, including the capacity of existing campuses and centers to accommodate those needs, and the development of new campuses and centers. This planning framework should be submitted to the Commission for review and comment before proceeding with plans for location and construction of new campuses.

2. Segments are requested to defer the selection of specific sites for new campuses or permanent off-campus centers until such time as they have informed the Commission of their general plans for expansion and received a recommendation from the Commission to proceed with further expansion activity. No later than one year prior to the date the segment expects to forward a final proposal for a new campus or center to the Commission, or 18 months prior to the time when it hopes

the Commission will forward its final recommendation about the facility to the Governor and Legislature, it is requested to transmit a letter of intent to expand to the Commission. The letter of intent should include, at minimum, the following information for the new campus: (1) preliminary projections of enrollment demand by age of student and level of instruction, (2) its general location, and (3) the basis on which the segment has determined that expansion in this area at this time is a systemwide priority in contrast to other potential segmental priorities. Other information that may be available that will be required at the time of the final needs study (see below, item 1-4) may also be submitted at this time.

3. Once the "letter of intent" is received, Commission staff will review the enrollment projections and other data and information that serve as the basis for the proposed new campus. This review will be done in consultation with staff from the Demographic Research Unit in the State Department of Finance, which is the agency statutorily responsible for demographic research and population projections. If the plans appear to be reasonable, the Commission will recommend that the segments move forward with their site acquisition or further development plans. The Commission may in this process raise concerns with the segments about defects in the plans that need to be addressed in the planning process. If the Commission is unable to recommend approval of moving forward with the expansion plans, it shall so state to the segmental governing board prior to notifying the Department of Finance and the Legislature of its analysis and the basis for its negative recommendation. The Commission shall consider the preliminary plan no later than 60 days following its submission to the Commission.

4. Following the Commission's preliminary recommendation to move forward, the segments are requested to proceed with the final process of identifying potential sites for the campus or permanent off-campus center. If property appropriate for the campus or center is already owned by the segment, alternative sites to that must be identified and considered in the manner required by the California Environmental Quality Act. So as to avoid redundancy in preparation of information, all materials that are germane to the environmental impact report process shall be made available to the Commission at the same time that it is made available to the designated responsible agencies.

5. Upon completion of the environmental review process and no more than six months prior to the time of expected final Commission approval of the proposed new campus, the segment shall forward the final environmental impact report for the site as well as the final needs study report for the campus or center to the Commission. The needs study report should address each of the criteria outlined below on which the proposal for the campus or center will be evaluated.

6. Once the Commission has received from the segment all materials necessary for evaluating the proposal, it shall certify the completeness of the application to the segment. The Commission shall take final action on proposals during the next six months. In reviewing the proposal, the Commission will seek approval of the enrollment projections by the Demographic Research Unit, unless the justification for expansion is primarily unrelated to meeting access demands. Once the Commission has taken action on the proposal, it will so notify both the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

Criteria for evaluating proposals

1. *Enrollment projections*

1.1 For new facilities that are planned to accommodate expanded enrollments, enrollment projections should be sufficient to justify the establishment of the campus or off-campus center. For the proposed new campus or center, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation, and for the fifteenth and twentieth years, must be provided. When an existing off-campus center is proposed to be converted to a new campus, all previous enrollment experience must also be provided.

As the designated demographic agency for the State, the Demographic Research Unit has lead responsibility for preparing systemwide and district enrollment projections, as well as projections for specific

proposals. The Demographic Research Unit will prepare enrollment projections for all Community College proposals, and either the Demographic Research Unit population projections or K-12 enrollment estimates must be used as the basis for generating enrollment projections in any needs study prepared by the University of California or the California State University. For the two University segments, the Commission will request the Demographic Research Unit to review and approve demographically-driven enrollment projections prior to Commission consideration of the final proposal, unless the campus or permanent center is justified on academic, policy, or other criteria that do not relate strictly to enrollment demand.

For graduate/professional student enrollment estimates, the specific methodology and/or rationale generating the estimates, an analysis of supply of and demand for graduate education, and the need for new graduate and professional degrees, must be provided.

1.2 Statewide enrollment projected for the University of California should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses as defined in their long-range development plans. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new campus must be demonstrated.

1.3 Statewide enrollment projected for the California State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses as defined by their enrollment ceilings. If the statewide enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated. In order for compelling regional needs to be demonstrated, the segment must specify how these regional needs deserve priority attention over competing segmental priorities.

1.4 Enrollment projected for a community college district should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district campuses. If the district enrollment projection does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district campuses, compelling regional or local needs must be demonstrated. In order for compelling regional needs to be demonstrated, the segment must specify how these regional needs deserve priority attention over others in the State.

1.5 Enrollments projected for community college campuses must be within a reasonable commuting time of the campus, and should exceed the minimum size for a community college district established by legislation (1,000 units of average daily attendance [ADA] two years after opening).

2. *Alternatives to new campuses or off-campus centers*

2.1 Proposals for a new campus or off-campus center should address alternatives to establishment of new institutions, including (1) the possibility of establishing an off-campus center instead of a campus; (2) the expansion of existing campuses; (3) the increased utilization of existing campuses, such as year-round operation; (4) the increased use of existing facilities and programs in other postsecondary education segments; and (5) the use of nontraditional modes of instructional delivery, such as telecommunication and distance learning.

2.2 A cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, including alternative sites for the campus or center must be articulated and documented.

3. *Serving the disadvantaged*

The campus or center must facilitate access for the economically, educationally, socially, and physically disadvantaged.

4. *Geographic and physical accessibility*

The physical, social, and demographic characteristics of the location and surrounding service areas for the new campus or center must be included. There must be a plan for student, faculty, and staff transportation to the proposed location. Plans for student and faculty housing, including projections of needed on-campus residential facilities, should be included as appropriate. For locations which do not plan to maintain student on-campus residences, reasonable commuting time for students must be demonstrated.

5. *Environmental and social impact*

The proposal must include a copy of the environmental impact report. To expedite the review process, the Commission should be provided all information related to the environmental impact report process as it becomes available to responsible agencies and the public.

6. *Effects on other institutions*

6.1 Other segments, institutions, and the community in which the campus or center is to be located should be consulted during the planning process for the new facility, especially at the time that alternatives to expansion are explored. Strong local, regional, and/or statewide interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated.

6.2 The establishment of a new University of California or California State University campus or center must take into consideration the impact of a new facility on existing and projected enrollments in the neighboring institutions of its own and of other segments.

6.3 The establishment of a new community college campus must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent community colleges -- either within the district proposing the new campus or in adjacent districts -- to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

7. *Academic planning and program justification*

The programs projected for the new campus must be described and justified. An academic master plan, including general sequence of program plans and degree level plans, and a campus plan to implement such State goals as access, quality, intersegmental cooperation, diversification of students, faculty, administration and staff for the new campus, must be provided. The proposal must include plans to provide an equitable learning environment for the recruitment, retention and success of historically underrepresented students.

8. *Consideration of needed funding*

A cost analysis of both capital outlay estimates and projected support costs for the new campus or permanent off-campus center, and possible options of alternative funding sources, must be provided.

Guidelines and Procedures for Review of New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers

Preface

It has been many years since a new campus was authorized for either the University of California or the California State University, and it is not anticipated that any will be proposed in the immediate future. In the past five years, the only authorized new campuses have been Orange County Community Colleges. Off-campus centers, however, continue to be proposed from time to time, and it is probable that some new centers will be offered for Commission review and recommendation in the future.

In April of 1975, the Commission adopted policies relating to the review of new campuses and centers, and revised those policies in September of 1978. The purpose was to provide the segments with specific directions whereby they could conform to two *Education Code* sections. The first of these directs the Commission to review proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers of public postsecondary education and to advise the Legislature and the Governor on the need for and location of these new campuses and centers (*Education Code* 66903). The second states the Legislature's intent that no funds for the acquisition of sites or for the construction of new campuses and off-campus centers by the public segments be authorized without the Commission's recommendation.

The 1975 document -- and the 1978 revision -- outlined the Commission's basic assumptions under which the guidelines and procedures were developed, and specified the proposals subject to Commission review, the criteria for reviewing proposals, the schedule to be followed by the segments when they submit proposals, and the required contents of "Needs Studies." As experience was gained with the guidelines, it became clear that some confusion was generated by this format, and that some instructions appeared to be ambiguous or difficult to interpret. In addition, there was the problem of applying the guidelines to operations that had been started totally with non-State funds -- especially Community College off-campus centers initiated solely with local money -- a distinction of considerable substance prior to passage of Proposition 13, but less meaningful thereafter. In several cases, doubt arose as to whether an existing center had been previously recommended by the Commission or "grandfathered" in by being initiated before the guidelines were adopted. In other cases, although the Commission was notified, it took no action because no State money was involved or anticipated. When State funds were later requested, some districts acquired the mistaken impression that a favorable recommendation had been secured, and were surprised to learn that they had to participate in an extended review process with no assurance that State funds would be approved.

The purpose of this document is to resolve the questions and ambiguities surrounding the original (1975) and updated (1978) guidelines. To that end -- although large sections remain virtually unchanged -- three major revisions are included:

1. The original guidelines stated that the Commission would review new off-campus centers "that will require either State or local funding for acquisition, remodeling or construction, and/or (2) those planned for use for three or more years at a given location, and which (a) will offer courses in two or more certificate and/or degree programs, and/or (b) will have a headcount enrollment of 500 or more."

   The revised guidelines included in this document specify the need for review and recommendation only for operations "that will require State funding for construction, acquisition, remodeling, or lease. Those operations involving no State funds may be considered by the Commission for review and recommendation, but are reported primarily for inventory purposes." The location, program, and enrollment criteria are removed from the guidelines, leaving State funding the sole condition for requiring the Commission's recommendation. Review requirements for centers that have been in existence for several years at the

time State funds are requested are specified below.

2. The original guidelines contained both "Criteria" for reviewing new proposals and a section entitled "Content of Needs Study" that was largely repetitive. In this document, the latter section has been subsumed under an expanded "Criteria" section.

3. The time schedules in the original guidelines and procedures were inconsistent between the four-year segments and the Community Colleges. This revision attempts to make the schedules more consistent for all segments.

Without question, the most difficult problem surrounding the Commission's role in the review of new campuses and off-campus centers concerns operations started without State money but needing State money at a later date. Obviously, it is impossible to ignore the fact that such operations exist, but at the same time, the Commission cannot allow prior existence to constitute a higher priority for State funds than would be accorded a proposal for a completely new facility. Were existing campuses and centers given such a priority, it could encourage the segments to "seed" new operations from non-State sources on the assumption that State money could be obtained more easily later. Accordingly, the Commission must regard any request for State funds, whether for an existing or new campus or center, as being applicable to a new operation. Thus, while these guidelines and procedures require Commission review and recommendation only for State-funded operations, the Commission strongly suggests that any segment anticipating the need for State funds later take steps to secure the Commission's favorable recommendation at the earliest possible time. If such steps are taken, it should be possible to avoid denying funds to an existing center.

Although these guidelines and procedures are directed to public postsecondary education, the Commission invites and encourages the independent colleges and universities and the private vocational schools to submit their proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers to the Commission for review, thus facilitating the statewide planning activities of the Commission. This invitation to the independent segment was first extended by the Commission on April 14, 1975, at the time these guidelines and procedures were first approved. A similar invitation was extended on March 17, 1980, with respect to degree programs to be offered at off-campus locations (*Degrees of Diversity: Off-Campus Education in California*, California Postsecondary Education Commission Report No. 80-5, p. 100).

Assumptions basic to the development of guidelines and procedures for Commission review of proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers

The following assumptions are considered to be central to the development of a procedure for Commission review of proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers.

- The University of California and the California State University will continue to admit every eligible undergraduate applicant, although the applicant may be subject to redirection from the campus of first choice.

- The University of California plans and develops its campuses on the basis of statewide need.

- The California State University plans and develops its campuses on the basis of statewide needs and special regional considerations.

- The California Community Colleges plan and develop their campuses and off-campus centers on the basis of open enrollment for all students capable of benefiting from the instruction and on the basis of local needs.

- Planned enrollment capacities are established for and observed by all campuses of public postsecondary education. These capacities are determined on the basis of statewide and institutional economies, campus environment, limitations on campus size, program and student mix, and internal organization. Planned capacities are established by the governing boards of Community College districts (and reviewed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges), the Trustees of the California State University, and the Regents of the University of Califor-

nia. These capacities are subject to review and recommendation by the Commission.

Proposals subject to Commission review

New campuses

The Commission will review proposals for all new campuses of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges.

New off-campus centers

For the purposes of this section, "State funds" are defined as any and all monies from State General Fund appropriations and/or property tax revenues.

University of California and California State University: The Commission is concerned with off-campus educational operations established and administered by a campus of either segment, the central administration of either segment, or by a consortium of colleges and/or universities sponsored wholly or in part by either of the above. Operations that are to be reported to the Commission for review are those which will provide instruction in programs leading to degrees, and which will require State funding for construction, acquisition, remodeling, or lease. Those that involve funding from other than State sources may be considered by the Commission for review and recommendation, but need be reported only as part of the Commission's *Inventory of Off-Campus Facilities and Programs* (*Education Code* Sec. 66903[13]).

California Community Colleges: The Commission is concerned with off-campus operations established and administered by an existing Community College, a Community College district, or by a consortium of colleges and universities sponsored wholly or in part by either of the above. Operations to be reported to the Commission for review and recommendation are those that will require State funding (as defined above) for construction, acquisition, remodeling, or lease. Those operations not involving State funds may be considered by the Commission for review and recommendation, but need be reported only as part of the Commission's *Inventory of Off-Campus Facilities and Programs*.

Consortia: When a consortium involves more than one public segment, or a public and the independent segment, one of those segments must assume primary responsibility for presenting the proposal to the Commission for review.

All Proposals: All off-campus operations must be reported to the Commission, either through the requirements of these guidelines and procedures, or through the *Inventory of Off-Campus Facilities and Programs*. Any off-campus center established without State funds will be considered to be a new center as of the time State funds are requested for construction, acquisition, remodeling, or lease.

Criteria for reviewing proposals

All proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers required by these guidelines to be submitted by any segment of higher education in California must include a comprehensive "Needs Study." This study must satisfy all of the criteria specified below, and will constitute the basis for the Commission's evaluation of proposals. As noted in the Preface, all first-time requests for State funds will be considered as applying to new operations, regardless of the length of time such campuses or centers have been in existence.

Criteria for reviewing new campuses

1. Enrollment projections should be sufficient to justify the establishment of the campus. For the proposed new campus, and for each of the existing campuses in the district or system, enrollment projections for each of the first ten years of operation, and for the fifteenth and twentieth years, must be provided. For an existing campus, all previous enrollment experience must also be provided. Department of Finance enrollment projections must be included in any needs study.

2. Alternatives to establishing a campus must be considered. These alternatives must include: (1) the possibility of establishing an off-campus center instead of a campus; (2) the expansion of ex-

isting campuses; and (3) the increased utilization of existing campuses.

3. Other segments, institutions, and the community in which the campus is to be located must be consulted during the planning process for the new campus. Strong local or regional interest in the proposed campus must be demonstrated.

4. Statewide enrollment projected for the University of California should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing University campuses. If statewide enrollment does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling statewide needs for the establishment of the new campus must be demonstrated.

5. Projected statewide enrollment demand on the California State University system should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing State University campuses. If statewide enrollment does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity for the system, compelling regional needs must be demonstrated.

6. Projected enrollment demand on a Community College district should exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district campuses. If district enrollment does not exceed the planned enrollment capacity of existing district campuses, compelling local needs must be demonstrated.

7. The establishment of a new University of California or California State University campus must take into consideration existing and projected enrollments in the neighboring institutions of its own and of other segments.

8. The establishment of a new Community College campus must not reduce existing and projected enrollments in adjacent Community Colleges -- either within the district proposing the new campus or in adjacent districts -- to a level that will damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity at these institutions, or lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

9. Enrollments projected for Community College campuses must be within a reasonable commuting time of the campus, and should exceed the minimum size for a Community College district established by legislation (1,000 units of average daily attendance [ADA] two years after opening).

10. The programs projected for the new campus must be described and justified.

11. The characteristics (physical, social, demographic, etc.) of the location proposed for the new campus must be included.

12. The campus must facilitate access for the economically, educationally, and socially disadvantaged.

Criteria for reviewing new off-campus centers

1. Enrollment projections should be sufficient to justify the establishment of the new off-campus center. Five-year projections must be provided for the proposed center, with enrollments indicated to be sufficient to justify its establishment. For the University of California and the California State University, five-year projections of the nearest campus of the segment proposing the center must also be provided. For the Community Colleges, five-year projections of all district campuses, and of any other campuses within ten miles of the proposed center, regardless of district, must be provided. When State funds are requested for an existing center, all previous enrollment experience must also be provided. Department of Finance enrollment estimates must be included in any needs study.

2. The segment proposing an off-campus center must submit a comprehensive cost/benefit analysis of all alternatives to establishing the center. This analysis must include: (1) the expansion of existing campuses; (2) the expansion of existing off-campus centers in the area; (3) the increased utilization of existing campus and off-campus centers; and (4) the possibility of using leased or donated space in instances where the center is to be located in facilities proposed to be owned by the campus.

3. Other public segments and adjacent institutions, public or private, must be consulted during the planning process for the new off-campus center.

4. Programs to be offered at the proposed center must meet the needs of the community in which the center is to be located. Strong local or regional interest in the proposed facility must be demonstrated.

5. The proposed off-campus center must not lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs at neighboring campuses or off-campus centers, regardless of segment or district boundaries.

6. The establishment of University and State University off-campus centers should take into consideration existing and projected enrollment in adjacent institutions, regardless of segment.

7. The location of a Community College off-campus center should not cause reductions in existing or projected enrollments in adjacent Community Colleges, regardless of district, to a level that would damage their economy of operation, or create excess enrollment capacity, at these institutions.

8. The proposed off-campus center must be located within a reasonable commuting time for the majority of residents to be served.

9. The programs projected for the new off-campus center must be described and justified.

10. The characteristics (physical, social, demographic, etc.) of the location proposed for the new off-campus center must be included.

11. The off-campus center must facilitate access for the economically, educationally, and socially disadvantaged.

Schedule for submitting proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers

The basic intent of the time schedule for submitting proposals to establish new campuses and off-campus centers is to involve Commission staff early in the planning process and to make certain that elements needed for Commission review are developed within the needs study described previously in these guidelines and procedures.

The schedules suggested below are dependent upon the dates when funding for the new campus or off-campus center is included in the Governor's Budget and subsequently approved by the Legislature. Prior to the date of funding, certain events must occur, including:

1. A needs study to be authorized and conducted with notification to the Commission;

2. District and/or system approval of the proposed campus or off-campus center;

3. Commission review and recommendation;

4. Budget preparation by segmental staff;

5. Segmental approval of the budget;

6. Department of Finance review for inclusion in the Governor's Budget;

7. Consideration by the Legislature; and

8. Signing of the budget bill by the Governor.

Specific schedules are suggested below for all proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers requiring State funds for construction, acquisition, remodeling, or lease. As noted previously, however, the Commission may review proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers, regardless of the source of funding. This may require revisions in the suggested schedules. Therefore, the specific timetables outlined below should be considered as guidelines for the development of proposals and not deadlines. However, timely Commission notification of, and participation in the needs study, is important, and will be a factor considered in the Commission's review of proposals.

Schedule for new campuses

University of California and California State University

1. Needs study authorized by the Regents of the University of California or by the Trustees of the

California State University, with notification to the Commission (30 months before funding).

2. Needs study conducted by segmental staff with appropriate participation by Commission staff (29-19 months before funding).

3. Regents or Trustees approve new campus (18 months before funding).

4. Approval review by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (17-15 months before funding).

5. Budget preparation by segmental staff (14-11 months before funding).

6. Budget approval by Regents or Trustees (10 months before funding).

7. Review by the Department of Finance (9-7 months before funding).

8. Consideration by the Legislature (6-0 months before funding).

9. Funding.

California Community Colleges

1. Needs study authorized by the local district board with notification to the Board of Governors and the Commission (32 months before funding).

2. Needs study conducted by the district staff with appropriate participation by staff from the Board of Governors and the Commission (31-21 months before funding).

3. Local board approves campus (20 months before funding).

4. Approval review by the Board of Governors (19-18 months before funding).

5. Approval review by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (17-16 months before funding).

6. Budget preparation by the Board of Governors' staff and the Department of Finance review (15-3 months before funding).

7. Consideration by the Legislature (3-0 months before funding).

8. Funding.

Schedule for new off-campus centers

University of California and California State University

1. Needs study authorized by the segment with notification to the Commission (12 months before funding).

2. Needs study conducted by segmental staff with appropriate participation by Commission staff (11-9 months before funding).

3. Regents or Trustees approve new off-campus center (9 months before funding).

4. Review by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (8-6 months before funding).

5. Budget preparation by segmental staff (8-6 months before funding).

6. Review by the Department of Finance (6-3 months before funding).

7. Consideration by the Legislature (3-0 months before funding).

8. Funding.

California Community Colleges

1. Needs study authorized by local district board with notification to the Board of Governors and the Commission (18-16 months before funding).

2. Needs study conducted by district staff with appropriate participation by staff from the Board of Governors and the Commission (15-13 months before funding).

3. Local board approves off-campus center (12-11 months before funding).

4. Needs study submitted to the Board of Governors (9 months before funding).

5. Approval review by the Board of Governors (9 months before funding).

6. Needs study submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (8 months before funding).

7. Approval review by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (8-6 months before funding).

8. Budget preparation by the Board of Governors and review by the Department of Finance (6-3 months before funding).

9. Consideration by the Legislature (3-0 months before funding).

10. Funding.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of February 1990, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles;
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach;
Henry Der, San Francisco;
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco;
Rosalind K. Goddard, Los Angeles;
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach;
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero; *Vice Chair;*
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles; *Chair;* and
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto.

Representatives of the segments are:

Meredith J. Khachigian, San Clemente; appointed by the Regents of the University of California;

Theodore J. Saenger, San Francisco; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University;

John F. Parkhurst, Folsom; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges;

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions;

Joseph D. Carrabino, Orange; appointed by the California State Board of Education; and

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by the Governor from nominees proposed by California's independent colleges and universities.

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, its meetings are open to the public. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request before the start of the meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985; telephone (916) 445-7933.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSED CAMPUSES AND OFF-CAMPUS CENTERS

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 90-9

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

89-21 State Oversight of Postsecondary Education: Three Reports on California's Licensure of Private Institutions and Reliance on Non-Governmental Accreditation [A reprint of Reports 89-13, 89-17, and 89-18] (June 1989)

89-22 Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University (June 1989)

89-23 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, 1988-89: The University of California, The California State University, and California's Independent Colleges and Universities (August 1989)

89-24 California College-Going Rates, Fall 1988 Update: The Twelfth in a Series of Reports on New Freshman Enrollments at California's Colleges and Universities by Recent Graduates of California High Schools (September 1989)

89-25 Overseeing the Heart of the Enterprise: The Commission's Thirteenth Annual Report on Program Projection, Approval, and Review Activities, 1987-88 (September 1989)

89-26 Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1988-89: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation (September 1989)

89-27 Technology and the Future of Education: Directions for Progress. A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission's Policy Task Force on Educational Technology (September 1989)

89-28 Funding for the California State University's Statewide Nursing Program: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act (October 1989)

89-29 First Progress Report on the Effectiveness of Intersegmental Student Preparation Programs: One of Three Reports to the Legislature in Response to Item 6420-0011-001 of the 1988-89 Budget Act (October 1989)

89-30 Evaluation of the Junior MESA Program: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 610 (Hughes) of 1985 (October 1989)

89-31 Legislation Affecting Higher Education During the First Year of the 1989-90 Session: A Staff Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (October 1989)

89-32 California Colleges and Universities, 1990: A Guide to Degree-Granting Institutions and to Their Degree and Certificate Programs (December 1989)

90-1 Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century (January 1990)

90-2 Technical Background Papers to *Higher Education at the Crossroads: Planning for the Twenty-First Century* (January 1990)

90-3 A Capacity for Learning: Revising Space and Utilization Standards for California Public Higher Education (January 1990)

90-4 Survey of Space and Utilization Standards and Guidelines in the Fifty States: A Report of MGT Consultants, Inc., Prepared for and Published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-5 Calculation of Base Factors for Comparison Institutions and Study Survey Instruments: Technical Appendix to *Survey of Space and Utilization Standards and Guidelines in the Fifty States*. A Second Report of MGT Consultants, Inc., Prepared for and Published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-6 Final Report, Study of Higher Education Space and Utilization Standards/Guidelines in California: A Third Report of MGT Consultants, Inc., Prepared for and Published by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-7 Legislative Priorities of the Commission, 1990: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-8 State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1990: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (January 1990)

90-9 Guidelines for Review of Proposed Campuses and Off-Campus Centers: A Revision of the Commissions 1982 *Guidelines and Procedures for Review of New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers* (January 1990)